

REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated December 30, 2005, the Examiner states that Claims 1-18 are pending and Claims 1-18 are rejected. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the claims, and the drawings.

In the Office Action, the previous rejections to the claims as being anticipated by either GB 2,296,977 (Ueyanagi), or US 4,553,436 (Hansson), have been maintained. It was previously argued that the prior art does not disclose the claimed feature of the load platform being thin relative to the surrounding frame. The Examiner considers the load platform of the prior art to be "thin". The Examiner also seems to indicate that the rejection may be overcome by more clearly stating in the claims that the load platform is thinner than the surrounding frame. Independent Claim 1 has been amended accordingly. The Applicant herewith reiterates the previous arguments.

The prior art structure does not show any load platform. A load platform is by definition a platform for receiving an object to be weighed. The structure detail 901 (fig. 18 A) of Ueyanagi is a weight in itself (see accompanying text). No object can be placed thereon (because the structure is in practice necessarily inside a closed container, and because the function of the accelerometer would be ruined if extra objects were placed on detail 901). So detail 901 is not a load platform, even if the layout in a top view (fig. 18 A) is similar to our layout.

Ueyanagi does not show a scale (even if an acceleration sensor may look the same), it does not show a load platform (even if 901 looks similar in a top view), and detail 901 is not thinner than its surrounding frame (as appears from the text in pages 15-16, Ueyanagi).

The rejection states that "if the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim". The intended use of the invention is to weigh small objects. There is no explanation how the Ueyanagi device could be used for weighing anything at all. And further, adding an object to detail 901 would actually distort the acceleration measurements. It is of essence in the accelerometer, that the weight of 901 always be the same.

Furthermore, the Applicant disagrees that the device shown in Ueyanagi must be the same device as presently claimed, as a logical consequence of the fact that

the structure shown in a top view is similar in some respects, for the two cases under consideration. In a side view, a structural difference will be clearly visible, again related to the thickness of Ueyanagi's weight and the present invention's "load platform".

The rejection also refers to Fig. 2 of Ueyanagi, which figure shows no load platform, but a weight 10, see the text wording in Ueyanagi, and with a roof 850 above this weight. The roof makes it impossible to use this device as a weight. Additionally, the rejection refers to an opening beneath (that is closed off by the bottom of housing 850), but the bottom of housing 850, as shown in Fig. 2, completely disguises any such "opening". There is no opening in Fig. 2 of Ueyanagi. Please note that in the Ueyanagi text, page 2, there is only a statement regarding a "hermetically sealed container 850", indicating that 850 is actually one container unit without any opening.

Further, the rejection states that "since the device is made from silicon, then it is made from "glass".". However, silicon is not the same as glass. Silicon is an element Si, while glass is a substance of silicon oxide, boron oxide or phosphorus oxide fused together with certain basic oxides, e.g. sodium oxide, magnesium oxide, calcium oxide, potassium oxide. If something is made from glass, then it may perhaps contain silicon. But if something is made from silicon, then it is not necessarily made from glass.

In the Office Action, the drawing figures are objected to for not showing the claimed feature of the strain gauges orientated in the same direction. The Examiner indicates that the depicted strain gauges are too small to determine what direction they are oriented in. Perhaps the copy of the drawing figures that the Examiner has is of poor quality. Therefore, the Applicant submits herewith another copy of the drawing figures. No amendments have been made to those drawings. Drawing Figure 1 clearly shows the strain gauges in the shape of rectangles, with each strain gauge orientated in the same direction.

In the Office Action, Claim 12 is objected to with regard to the word "possibly". Claim 12 has been amended to remove the word "possibly" and the following limitation. That limitation has been reintroduced in new Claim 19.

Claim 17 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections

are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,



March 24, 2006

Date

Attorney for Applicant
Brian W. Hameder
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 45613